

**REMARKS**

The allowance of Claims 11-13 and 15 is acknowledged.

It is believed that this response is fully responsive to the Office Action mailed September 8, 2009.

In the Office Action, Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ishibashi et al. (JP 2003-113673). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In a Response to Arguments portion of the Office Action, the Examiner comments:

Regarding Applicant's argument that '673 does not have a first base end fixation member and a top end fixation member with width larger than a diameter of the rod, refer to FIG. 3 of '673 and note that the rings have a larger diameter than the rod over which they are attached.

It is respectfully submitted that '673 is being mischaracterized. The alleged wire rods (13), as shown in FIGS. 3 and 4, have a pattern of raised portions along their length. That is, the raised areas are a part of the wire rod and the raised portions are molded or otherwise formed during fabrication of the wire rods. It is respectfully submitted that the raised portions are not "rings" attached to a uniform diameter rod, as implied by the Office Action. The wire rods (13) of '673 are

deformed reinforcing rebars.

In view of the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 20, 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Osaka (JP 7238690). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In view of the amendment made in the response to the previous Office Action, that is, that the reinforced member injection hole is formed between the inner face side and the outer face side of the reinforced concrete structure, the Office Action is now pointing out that the alleged reinforced member injection hole is partially within the reinforced concrete structure object (1) and partially in the mortar layer (b) of JP '690.

It is respectfully submitted that JP '690 is concerned with a crevice, on a boundary of a concrete building frame and a mortar layer, being swollen and separated by excessive injection of an epoxy resin type filler. JP '690 is concerned with anchoring the mortar layer to the concrete building frame (see Abstract).

The present invention is concerned with a means to resist a shearing force in a reinforced concrete structure when a shearing force is active on the structure.

Firstly, the problems to be solved by the two inventions are completely different. It is respectfully submitted that one would not look to JP '690 to solve the problem solved by the present invention. Secondly, JP '690 does not teach to have the base end width broadening part within the

concrete portion, as is required by the present claim.

In regard to Claims 20, 21 and 25, in JP '690, the alleged "wire rod" does not have a length shorter than a total length of the reinforced member injection hole in the reinforced concrete structure, as presently defined in Claim 20. Also as discussed above, one would not be led to JP '690 to solve the problem of the present invention.

In view of the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 2, 5 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaka '690 in view of Tuska (U.S. Patent No. 3,599,379). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from Claim 1 and Claims 22-24 depend from Claim 20, which are discussed above.

In view of the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osaka in view of Rossi (U.S. Patent No. 6,860,935). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 6 and 7 depend from Claim 1, which is discussed above.

In view of the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 17 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/588,499

unpatentable over Ishibashi et al. (JP 2003-113673) in view of Andraet et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,867,960). Reconsideration and removal of this rejection are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 17 and 26 depend from Claim 10, which is discussed above.

In view of the above remarks, removal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Claims 1-7, 10, 17 and 20-26 as well as allowable Claims 11-13 and 15 are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.


If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/588,499**

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP

  
James N. Baker  
Agent for Applicant  
Reg. No. 40,899

JNB/ak

Atty. Docket No. **060563**  
Suite 400  
1420 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 659-2930



**23850**

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE